DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to the communication filed on July 18,

2008 which paper has been placed of record in the file. Claims 1-64 are pending

in this application and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or
> composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent
> therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3.   Claims 32-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed

invention is directed to nonstatutory subject matter. Based on Supreme Court

precedent, a method/process claim must (1) be tied to another statutory class of

invention (such as a particular apparatus) (see at least Diamond v. Diehr, 450

U.S. 175, 184 (1981); Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584,588 n.9 (1978); Gottschalk

v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88

(1876)) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or

materials) to a different state or thing (see at least Gottschalk v. Benson, 409

U.S. 63, 71 (1972)). A method/process claim that fails to meet one of the above

requirements is not in compliance with the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C.

101 for patent eligible subject matter. Here claims 32-63 fail to meet the above

requirements because the claims fail to tie in another statutory class of invention.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-65 have been considered

but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   **Claims 1-5, 7-9, 17, 32-36, 38-40, 48, and 63-64** are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Feingold et al. [US Pub No.**

2003/0172017 A1].

6.   Regarding **claim 1**, Feingold discloses an apparatus for use in a real-time

financial market portfolio monitoring system, for continuously valuing a data

collection comprising a first plurality of data items, the apparatus comprising:

storage means for storing the first plurality of data items, said storage means

further storing a second plurality of data items, each data item of the first plurality

having assigned a respective one of the data items of the second plurality, each

data item of the second plurality representing an individual data item value

(0029). Feingold discloses an interface module for establishing data connections

to receive input data (0016). Feingold discloses a processor for continuously

updating data items of the second plurality stored in said storage means based

upon the received input data, and calculating a data collection value for the data

collection based on data item values of the updated data items (0030-0033).

Feingold discloses wherein the apparatus further comprises: a controller for

controlling said interface module to connect to one or more of at least two data

sources to receive said input data (0016, 0038-0039).

7.   Regarding **claim 2**, Feingold discloses wherein said data collection

represents a portfolio of financial instruments, each data item of the first plurality

comprises an identifier identifying at least one of said financial instruments, and

the individual data item values represented by the data items of the second

plurality indicate prices of the respective financial instruments (0029).

8.   Regarding **claim 3**, Feingold discloses wherein said controller is adapted

to control said interface module to change said data connections based on a

time-driven schedule (0055).

9.   Regarding **claim 4**, Feingold discloses wherein said controller is adapted

to receive an input control signal to control said interface module to change said

data connections in an event-driven manner based on said input control signal
(0055).

10.   Regarding **claim 5**, Feingold discloses wherein said processor is capable
of continuously updating a data item of the second plurality based upon input
data received substantially simultaneously from two or more data sources (0030-
0033).

11.   Regarding **claim 7**, Feingold discloses wherein each data item value
represented by one of the data items of the second plurality is of one of at least
two data item types, and said storage means further stores a third plurality of
data items, each data item of the second plurality having assigned a respective
one of the data items of the third plurality, each data item of the third plurality
identifying the data item type relating to the data item value represented by the
corresponding data item of the second plurality (0031).

12.   Regarding **claim 8**, Feingold discloses wherein said processor is capable
of calculating said data collection value based on data item values of different
types (0031).

13.   Regarding **claim 9**, Feingold discloses wherein said input data comprises
value information and unit information, and said processor is capable of
converting values of different units into corresponding values of a predefined unit

by applying appropriate conversion factors, before calculating said data collection

value (0031).

14.　　Regarding **claim 17**, Feingold discloses wherein said storage means

further stores amount data indicating an individual amount assigned to each of

said data items of the first plurality (0029).

15.　　Regarding **claim 32**, this claim recites similar language as to claim 1 and

is rejected on the same grounds.

16.　　Regarding **claim 33**, this claim recites similar language as to claim 2 and

is rejected on the same grounds.

17.　　Regarding **claim 34**, this claim recites similar language as to claim 3 and

is rejected on the same grounds.

18.　　Regarding **claim 35**, this claim recites similar language as to claim 4 and

is rejected on the same grounds.

19.　　Regarding **claim 36**, this claim recites similar language as to claim 5 and

is rejected on the same grounds.

20.   Regarding **claim 38**, this claim recites similar language as to claim 7 and

is rejected on the same grounds.

21.   Regarding **claim 39**, this claim recites similar language as to claim 8 and

is rejected on the same grounds.

22.   Regarding **claim 40**, this claim recites similar language as to claim 9 and

is rejected on the same grounds.

23.   Regarding **claim 48**, this claim recites similar language as to claim 17 and

is rejected on the same grounds.

24.   Regarding **claims 63 and 64**, each of these claims recite similar language

as to claim 1 and are rejected on the same grounds.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

25.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

26.   Claims **6 and 37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over **Feingold et al. [US Pub No. 2003/0172017 A1]** in view of

Matus et al. [US Pub No. 2003/0233309 A1].

27.   Regarding **claim 6**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose wherein said

processor is further arranged to perform a calculation algorithm upon input data

received from said two or more data sources. However Matus teaches the user

can calculate what values the remaining fields would have based on this

transaction percentage. A different transaction percentage can be input or a

value can be input into a different field (such as the shares field independent of

the transaction percentage) and the values of the remaining fields can be

calculated. [0042]

        At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the teachings of

Matus to obtain invention as specified in claim 6. The rationale to combine the

teachings would be for 0simultaneously providing values related to the identifier.

28.   Regarding **claim 37**, this claim recites similar language as to claim 6 and

is rejected on the same grounds.

29.   Claims **10-11 and 41-42** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over **Feingold et al. [US Pub No. 2003/0172017 A1] in** view of

Black et al. [US Patent No. 6,012,042].

30.   Regarding **claim 10**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose wherein said
input data comprises value information, and said processor is capable of
determining unit information for the received value information dependent on the
respective data source or sources where said input data is received from, and
converting values of different units into corresponding values of a predefined unit
by applying appropriate conversion factors, before calculating said data collection
value. However Black teaches an improved securities analysis system includes
a data conversion device for converting both technical and fundamental data
about a security into a unified format for analysis by an analysis process engine.
[Abstract]

        At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary
skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the teachings of
Black to obtain invention as specified in claim 10. The rationale to combine the
teachings would be for transforming data into a unified format for analysis by an
analysis process engine.

31.   Regarding **claim 11**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose wherein said
input data further comprises rate information indicating said conversion factors.
However Black teaches an improved securities analysis system includes a data
conversion device for converting both technical and fundamental data about a
security into a unified format for analysis by an analysis process engine. The
analysis process engine processes the disparate data in accordance with a set of

rules and the results are forwarded to a display for viewing or used in further

analysis. [Col. 13 lines 32-42]

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the teachings of

Black to obtain invention as specified in claim 11. The rationale to combine the

teachings would be for transforming data into a unified format for analysis by an

analysis process engine.

32.   Claims **12** and **43** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over **Feingold et al. [US Pub No. 2003/0172017 A1]** in view of

Black et al. [US Patent No. 6,012,042], and further in view of **Brandenburg et**

al. [US Pub No. 2006/0077904 A1].

33.   Regarding **claim 12,** Feingold does not explicitly disclose wherein said

interface module is capable of establishing different data connections to receive

said value information and said rate information. However Brandenburg teaches

processing of data packets from different data connections with different

transmission bit rates. [0011]

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the teachings of

Brandenburg to obtain invention as specified in claim 12. The rationale to

combine the teachings is to more efficiently transfer data.

34.   Regarding **claim 43**, it recites similar language as to claim 12 and is
rejected on the same grounds.

35.   Claims **13** and **44** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over **Feingold et al. [US Pub No. 2003/0172017 A1]** in view of
Black et al. [US Patent No. 6,012,042], and further in view of **Wang [US Patent
No. 7,305,422]**.

36.   Regarding **claim 13**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose wherein said
processor is arranged to update said data items of the second plurality based
upon received rate information even if no value information is received, and
recalculate said data collection value based on data item values of the updated
data items. However Wang discloses a program that performs computationally
intensive calculations uses a particular piece of data that is stored as a data item
in a database. Using the techniques described herein, the calculations may be
performed as a transaction within a database server that manages the data item.
During the execution of the calculations, the server may perform a series of
updates to this data item. Prior to each update of the data item, the database
server generates a record that reflects the state of the data item. During
subsequent phases of the calculations, the calculations may require previous
values of the data item. [Col. 2 lines 16-28]
       At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary
skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the teachings of

Wang to obtain invention as specified in claim 13. The rationale to combine the teachings would be for effective processing of computationally intensive calculations.

37.   Regarding **claim 44**, it recites similar language as to claim 13 and is rejected on the same grounds.

38.   Claims **14, 16, 45** and **47** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Feingold et al. [US Pub No. 2003/0172017 A1]** in view of **Vishnubhotla [US Pub No. 2004/0010505 A1]**.

39.   Regarding **claim 14**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose wherein said processor is adapted to calculate said data collection value also based on at least one estimation value obtained by applying a predefined value determination algorithm, in case a data item value is not available. However Vishnubhotla discloses predefined data mining algorithms comprise a radial basis function algorithm for value prediction and the production scored data comprises a prediction field containing a value calculated by executing the data mining algorithm in scoring mode. [Page 14, claim 12]

        At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the teachings of Vishnubhotla to obtain invention as specified in claim 14. The rationale to

combine the teachings is to make the process more efficient and more consistent.

40.   Regarding **claim 16**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose wherein said processor is adapted to calculate said data collection value also based on at least one estimation value in case a data item value is not available, said estimation value being obtained from either a configuration file stored in said storage means or from received input data. a predefined value determination algorithm, in case a data item value is not available. However Vishnubhotla discloses predefined data mining algorithms comprise a radial basis function algorithm for value prediction and the production scored data comprises a prediction field containing a value calculated by executing the data mining algorithm in scoring mode. [Page 14, claim 12]

        At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the teachings of Vishnubhotla to obtain invention as specified in claim 16. The rationale to combine the teachings is to make the process more efficient and more consistent.

41.   Regarding **claim 45**, it recites similar language as to claim 14 and is rejected on the same grounds.

42.   Regarding **claim 47**, it recites similar language as to claim 16 and is rejected on the same grounds.

43.   Claims **15** and **46** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Feingold et al. [US Pub No. 2003/0172017 A1]** in view of Vishnubhotla **[US Pub No. 2004/0010505 A1]** and further in view of **Gershon [US Pub No. 2005/0027634 A1].**

44.   Regarding **claim 15**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose wherein said predefined value determination algorithm comprises an implementation of the Balck-Scholes formula. However Gershon teaches calculating a theoretical value (IV) using a combination of known algorithms, e.g., based on the Black-Scholes model [0057]. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the teachings to obtain invention as specified in claim 15. The rationale to combine the teachings is because Black-Scholes model is the common benchmark in the industry for pricing derivatives.

45.   Regarding **claim 46**, it recites similar language as to claim 15 and is rejected on the same grounds.

46.   Claims **18** and **49** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over **Feingold et al. [US Pub No. 2003/0172017 A1]** in view of

Naka et al. [US Pub No. 2002/0083238 A1].

47.   Regarding **claim 18**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose wherein said

processor is adapted to adjust the amount data of at least one data item in

response to a corporate action. However Naka teaches a storing-reproducing

apparatus with this structure is capable of automatically optimizing the bit rate in

order to completely store target data in the available space in the storage

medium [0035]. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the

teachings of Naka to obtain invention as specified in claim 18. The rationale to

combine the teachings would be for improving the operability of the apparatus for

the user.

48.   Regarding **claim 49**, it recites similar language as to claim 18 and is

rejected on the same grounds.

49.   Claims **19** and **50** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over **Feingold et al. [US Pub No. 2003/0172017 A1]** in view of

Naka **et al. [US Pub No. 2002/0083238 A1]** and further in view of **Nakajima et**

al. [US Pub No. 2002/0198870 A1].

50.   Regarding **claim 19**, Feingold does not disclose wherein said processor is
adapted to determine a synthetic value of at least one data item of the second
plurality by adjusting existing data item values in case of a corporate action, and
calculate said data collection value also based on said synthetic value. However
Nakajima teaches a result-of-search list page on the basis of the fitting value
calculation target property information suite and a synthetic fitting value suite
obtained by calculating the synthetic fitting values with respect to the respective
pieces of property information that form the fitting value calculation target
property information suite [0118]. At the time of the invention it would have been
obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to
include the teachings of Nakajima to obtain invention as specified in claim 19.
The rationale to combine the teachings is to easily determine a synthetic value.

51.   Regarding **claim 50**, it recites similar language as to claim 19 and is
rejected on the same grounds.

52.   Claims **20-24** and **51-55** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over **Feingold et al. [US Pub No. 2003/0172017 A1]** in view of
Gotz et al. [US Pub No. 2004/0034699 A1] hereinafter referred to as Gotz.

53.   Regarding **claim 20**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose wherein said
processor is adapted to apply a filter algorithm on the received input data before
updating the data items of the second plurality, said filter algorithm being

configured to enable said processor to block input data that would, after having

updated data items of the second plurality, lead to data item values significantly

deviating from respective previous data item values, or from predefined reference

values. However Gotz discloses a filter condition is received from a user. The

filter condition includes at least one value of an attribute occurring in one or more

data collections in the first data management system and one or more data

collections in the second data management system. A first group of values of

attributes that uniquely identify a single data collection from the other data

collections is extracted from the leading data management system. Each value

extracted is associated with a data collection that meets the filter condition. A

second group of values of attributes that uniquely identify a single data collection

from the other data collections is extracted from the contrast data management

system. The first group of values of the uniquely identifying attribute is compared

with the second group of values of the uniquely identifying attribute to determine

whether each value of the uniquely identifying attribute in the first group

represents the same data collection as a value of the uniquely identifying

attribute in the second group. [0022]

          At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the teachings of

Gotz to obtain invention as specified in claim 20. The rationale to combine the

teachings would be to more efficiently manage the integrity of data.

54.   Regarding **claim 21**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose wherein said

processor is adapted to apply a filter algorithm on calculated data collection

values, said filter algorithm being configured to enable said processor to block a

calculated data collection value that significantly deviates from a previous data

collection value, or from a predefined reference value. However Gotz discloses a

filter condition is received from a user. The filter condition includes at least one

value of an attribute occurring in one or more data collections in the first data

management system and one or more data collections in the second data

management system. A first group of values of attributes that uniquely identify a

single data collection from the other data collections is extracted from the leading

data management system. Each value extracted is associated with a data

collection that meets the filter condition. A second group of values of attributes

that uniquely identify a single data collection from the other data collections is

extracted from the contrast data management system. The first group of values

of the uniquely identifying attribute is compared with the second group of values

of the uniquely identifying attribute to determine whether each value of the

uniquely identifying attribute in the first group represents the same data collection

as a value of the uniquely identifying attribute in the second group. [0022]

        At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the teachings of

Gotz to obtain invention as specified in claim 21. The rationale to combine the

teachings would be to more efficiently manage the integrity of data.

55.   Regarding **claim 22**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose an output

module for outputting calculated data collection values to one or more recipients,

wherein said processor is adapted to inhibit a blocked data collection value from

being output. . However Gotz discloses a filter condition is received from a user.

The filter condition includes at least one value of an attribute occurring in one or

more data collections in the first data management system and one or more data

collections in the second data management system. A first group of values of

attributes that uniquely identify a single data collection from the other data

collections is extracted from the leading data management system. Each value

extracted is associated with a data collection that meets the filter condition. A

second group of values of attributes that uniquely identify a single data collection

from the other data collections is extracted from the contrast data management

system. The first group of values of the uniquely identifying attribute is compared

with the second group of values of the uniquely identifying attribute to determine

whether each value of the uniquely identifying attribute in the first group

represents the same data collection as a value of the uniquely identifying

attribute in the second group. [0022]

         At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the teachings of

Gotz to obtain invention as specified in claim 22. The rationale to combine the

teachings would be to more efficiently manage the integrity of data.

56.   Regarding **claim 23**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose an output

module for outputting calculated data collection values to one or more recipients,

wherein said processor is adapted to control said output module to output a

blocked data collection value together with a flag indicating that the output data

collection value is unconfirmed. However Gotz discloses a filter condition is

received from a user. The filter condition includes at least one value of an

attribute occurring in one or more data collections in the first data management

system and one or more data collections in the second data management

system. A first group of values of attributes that uniquely identify a single data

collection from the other data collections is extracted from the leading data

management system. Each value extracted is associated with a data collection

that meets the filter condition. A second group of values of attributes that

uniquely identify a single data collection from the other data collections is

extracted from the contrast data management system. The first group of values

of the uniquely identifying attribute is compared with the second group of values

of the uniquely identifying attribute to determine whether each value of the

uniquely identifying attribute in the first group represents the same data collection

as a value of the uniquely identifying attribute in the second group. [0022]

        At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the teachings of

Gotz to obtain invention as specified in claim 23. The rationale to combine the

teachings would be to more efficiently manage the integrity of data.

57.   Regarding **claim 24**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose a user interface

module connected to receive user input data indicative of instructions to change

the blocking behaviour and/or adjust deviation limits of said filter algorithm.

However Gotz teaches a filter condition may be user-definable. A filter condition

may include one or more values for one or more attributes associated with a data

collection or may include one or more values for an attribute that uniquely

identifies a data collection. [0016]

        At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the teachings of

Gotz to obtain invention as specified in claim 24. The rationale to combine the

teachings would be to more efficiently manage the integrity of data.

58.   Regarding **claim 51**, it recites similar language as to claim 20 and is

rejected on the same grounds.

59.   Regarding **claim 52**, it recites similar language as to claim 21 and is

rejected on the same grounds.

60.   Regarding **claim 53**, it recites similar language as to claim 22 and is

rejected on the same grounds.

61.   Regarding **claim 54**, it recites similar language as to claim 23 and is

rejected on the same grounds.

62.   Regarding **claim 55**, it recites similar language as to claim 24 and is

rejected on the same grounds.

63.   Claims **25-28** and **56-59** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over **Feingold et al. [US Pub No. 2003/0172017 A1]** in view of

Lipscher et al. [US Pub No. 2004/0102971 A1].

64.   Regarding **claim 25**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose an output

module for outputting calculated data collection values to one or more recipients,

wherein said processor is adapted to convert calculated data collection values by

applying appropriate unit conversion factors, before controlling said output

module to output the values. However Lipscher teaches input may be any form

of input produced by a human or communication form suitable for human-to-

human communication. Examples may include voice, speech, gestures,

handwriting, facial expression, or a drawing/sketch/schematic. Symbolic data are

collections of values that can represent data in a computer. Examples may

include words, phrases, letters, numbers, unicode symbols, values for database

record, computer program variable values, and computer program variable

addresses. Symbolic data output may be output by the system, stored by the

system, displayed by the system, or transmitted to another system. However, the

symbolic data and natural input may take various forms. Further, various

conversions may be envisaged. [0031]

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the teachings of

Lipscher to obtain invention as specified in claim 25. The rationale to combine

the teachings would be for easily generating symbolic data from the input data.

65.   Regarding **claim 26**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose wherein said

processor is configured to apply multiple unit conversion factors for different

currencies to calculate multiple data collection values for individual recipients. .

However Lipscher teaches input may be any form of input produced by a human

or communication form suitable for human-to-human communication. Examples

may include voice, speech, gestures, handwriting, facial expression, or a

drawing/sketch/schematic. Symbolic data are collections of values that can

represent data in a computer. Examples may include words, phrases, letters,

numbers, unicode symbols, values for database record, computer program

variable values, and computer program variable addresses. Symbolic data output

may be output by the system, stored by the system, displayed by the system, or

transmitted to another system. However, the symbolic data and natural input may

take various forms. Further, various conversions may be envisaged. [0031]

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the teachings of

Lipscher to obtain invention as specified in claim 26. The rationale to combine

the teachings would be for easily generating symbolic data from the input data.

66.   Regarding **claim 27**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose wherein said

input data comprises rate information enabling said processor to determine said

unit conversion factors. However Lipscher teaches input may be any form of

input produced by a human or communication form suitable for human-to-human

communication. Examples may include voice, speech, gestures, handwriting,

facial expression, or a drawing/sketch/schematic. Symbolic data are collections

of values that can represent data in a computer. Examples may include words,

phrases, letters, numbers, unicode symbols, values for database record,

computer program variable values, and computer program variable addresses.

Symbolic data output may be output by the system, stored by the system,

displayed by the system, or transmitted to another system. However, the

symbolic data and natural input may take various forms. Further, various

conversions may be envisaged. [0031]

        At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the teachings of

Lipscher to obtain invention as specified in claim 27. The rationale to combine

the teachings would be for easily generating symbolic data from the input data.

67.   Regarding **claim 28**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose a user interface

module connected to receive user input data indicative of instructions to change

at least one of said unit conversion factors. However Lipscher teaches input may

be any form of input produced by a human or communication form suitable for

human-to-human communication. Examples may include voice, speech,

gestures, handwriting, facial expression, or a drawing/sketch/schematic.

Symbolic data are collections of values that can represent data in a computer.

Examples may include words, phrases, letters, numbers, unicode symbols,

values for database record, computer program variable values, and computer

program variable addresses. Symbolic data output may be output by the system,

stored by the system, displayed by the system, or transmitted to another system.

However, the symbolic data and natural input may take various forms. Further,

various conversions may be envisaged. [0031]

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the teachings of

Lipscher to obtain invention as specified in claim 28. The rationale to combine

the teachings would be for easily generating symbolic data from the input data.

68.   Regarding **claim 56**, it recites similar language as to claim 25 and is

rejected on the same grounds.

69.   Regarding **claim 57**, it recites similar language as to claim 26 and is

rejected on the same grounds.

70.   Regarding **claim 58**, it recites similar language as to claim 27 and is

rejected on the same grounds.

71.   Regarding **claim 59**, it recites similar language as to claim 28 and is
rejected on the same grounds.

72.   Claims **29-31** and **60-62** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over **Feingold et al. [US Pub No. 2003/0172017 A1]** in view of
Odenwalder et al. [US Pub No. 2003/0031149 A1].

73.   Regarding **claim 29**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose wherein said
processor is adapted to recalculate previously calculated data collection values
based on correction data indicating at least one corrected data item value of the
second plurality. However Odenwalder discloses a receiving device includes
means for receiving a transmission over at least one time slot, the transmission
comprising data and a value calculated from the data, recalculation means for
recalculating the value from the received data, and determination means for
determining the number of time slots of the transmission from the calculated and
recalculated values [0013]. At the time of the invention it would have been
obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to
include the teachings of Odenwalder to obtain invention as specified in claim 29.
The rationale to combine the teachings would be for proactively correcting
calculated values.

74.   Regarding **claim 30**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose wherein said
correction data is comprised in said input data. However Odenwalder discloses

a receiving device includes means for receiving a transmission over at least one time slot, the transmission comprising data and a value calculated from the data, recalculation means for recalculating the value from the received data, and determination means for determining the number of time slots of the transmission from the calculated and recalculated values [0013]. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the teachings of Odenwalder to obtain invention as specified in claim 30. The rationale to combine the teachings would be for proactively correcting calculated values.

75.   Regarding **claim 31**, Feingold does not explicitly disclose a user interface module connected to receive user input data indicative of said correction data. However Odenwalder discloses a receiving device includes means for receiving a transmission over at least one time slot, the transmission comprising data and a value calculated from the data, recalculation means for recalculating the value from the received data, and determination means for determining the number of time slots of the transmission from the calculated and recalculated values [0013]. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Feingold to include the teachings of Odenwalder to obtain invention as specified in claim 31. The rationale to combine the teachings would be for proactively correcting calculated values.

76.   Regarding **claim 60**, it recites similar language as to claim 29 and is rejected on the same grounds.

77.   Regarding **claim 61**, it recites similar language as to claim 30 and is rejected on the same grounds.

78.   Regarding **claim 62**, it recites similar language as to claim 31 and is rejected on the same grounds.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN POE whose telephone number is (571)272-9789. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Kramer can be reached on 571-272-6783. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/James A. Kramer/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3693

ktp